

***Re-entry Task Force***  
***Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice***  
**Minutes**

September 9, 2015, 1:30PM-4:30PM  
700 Kipling, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference room

**ATTENDEES:**

**CHAIR**

Stan Hilkey, Dept. of Public Safety

**TASK FORCE MEMBERS**

Jennifer Bradford, Metro State University of Denver

Monica Chambers, Department of Corrections

Mark Evans, Public Defender's Office

Tom Giacinti, Representing Community Corrections

Regi Huerter, Denver Crime Prevention and Control Commission (phone)

Sherri Hufford, Division of Probation Services

Evelyn Leslie, Colo. School for Family Therapy

Alfredo Pena, Parole Board

Beth McCann, State Representative

Joe Pelle, Boulder County Sheriff's Office

Melissa Roberts for Rick Raemisch, Dept. of Corrections

Pat Steadman, State Senator

Robert Werthwein, Division of Youth Corrections

Dave Young, District Attorney 17<sup>th</sup> JD (phone)

**STAFF**

Paul Herman/CCJJ consultant

Kim English/Division of Criminal Justice

Linda Harrison/Division of Criminal Justice

Germaine Miera/Division of Criminal Justice

**ADDITIONAL**

Anne Carter, Parole Board

Jessica Mardock, Parole Board

Jennifer Wagoner, Parole Board

Heather Garwood, Division of Probation Services (phone)

**ABSENT**

Hassan Latif, Second Chance Center

Christie Donner, Colo. Criminal Justice Reform Coalition

Kelly Friesen, Grand County Juvenile Justice Department / SB94

Charles Parkins, Division of Youth Corrections

<p><b>Issue/Topic:</b> Welcome and Introductions</p>	<p><b>Discussion:</b> Stan Hilkey was delayed due to a meeting with the Governor. Paul welcomed the group in his stead and thanked everyone for attending. Task force members and guests introduced themselves.</p>
--	---

<p><b>Issue/Topic:</b>  Report Outs  <b>Action:</b></p>	<p><b>Discussion:</b>  Paul began the meeting by reminding task force members that three working groups were created during the August meeting and that each of the three groups has met between that meeting and today and has information to report to the full task force. The three groups are the Race/Ethnicity/Gender Working Group, the Conditions Working Group and the Definitions Working Group.</p> <p><b>Race/Ethnicity/Gender Working Group</b> <i>PRESENTATION DISCUSSION</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kim English was the lead for this group which also included Regi Huerter, Anne Carter and Hassan Latif.</li> <li>• Kim directed task force members to a data packet in their handouts titled Risk Assessment Instruments and Race/Ethnicity. (Data handout attached to the end of these minutes)</li> <li>• The group did some analysis of the LSI and the CARAS.</li> <li>• Kim explained that the front sheet of the handout is a summary of everything that follows.</li> <li>• There's also some additional info on the front sheet that's not available in the other tables.</li> <li>• The group looked at the LSI with judicial data and looked at those convicted in FY14 who had an LSI completed within 100 days of that conviction.</li> <li>• 70% of those people had an LSI (Page 2, table 1).</li> <li>• Remember, the Judicial data base does not separate out Hispanic consistently, so what we have with the Judicial database is white, other, and black.</li> <li>• Compared to white and other, blacks are more likely to score high on the LSI.</li> <li>• That's consistent with the literature that there are a larger number of minorities falling into high risk categories.</li> <li>• The first table on page two shows the distribution.</li> <li>• Of all the high risk cases, 38% were blacks, 26% were others and 30% were white.</li> <li>• Likewise for low risk, 26% were black, 37% were other and 35% were white.</li> <li>• That's what we know about LSI with judicial data</li> <li>• The next page (Page 3) shows CARAS 6 risk level by gender and ethnicity.</li> <li>• CARAS is an actuarial risk assessment tool used by the parole board.</li> <li>• The board has been using a risk instrument since 1988.</li> </ul>
---	--

- Looking at the most recent version of the CARAS – among those released in 2008 and 2012, blacks and Native Americans are less likely to score low on the CARAS. Women are more likely to score low, very low and high.
- One statistic that is handy when looking at the accuracy of predictive instruments is the overall AUC (Area Under Curve). The AUC for the CARAS is .75 - which is a really good number.
- The AUC is a way of talking about the accuracy of an instrument that looks at outcomes. It balances the error rate. You can error with false negatives or you can error with a false positive. The AUC accounts for both kinds of errors.
- A perfect score is 1 and ‘no predictive validity at all’ would be a .5.
- Basically, the CARAS would be 75% at predictive.
- 75% is a very good score for the social sciences and in the social science literature. 75% could even be considered “good+”.
- Kim directed the group to look at page 3 and the break out for the CARAS 6 Risk Level by Gender and Ethnicity.
- An example of the way to read this table is that in the top table (on page 3) of all the Asians, 19% fall in the low risk category, etc.
- In looking at this table, at the very bottom there is a ‘total’ row which shows the overall portion of population that falls into each category.
- 11% are very low risk, 10% low risk, 21% medium, 31% high risk, 26% very high.
- The second table looks at the percentages within risk level. For example, of all the very low risk people Asians account for 1% of low risk people, Hispanics count for 41% of low risk and Caucasians count for 44% of low risk. 12% of African Americans are counted as low risk.
- Kim also noted that information can be found on the handout regarding technical parole returns by race/ethnicity.
- Whites in the Very Low Risk category were more likely to be revoked and Hispanics were less likely to be revoked.
- Revocation rates for Blacks were relatively stable across risk categories with the exception of the very high risk category where 23.5% of Blacks were revoked.
- The bottom line is we do have more minorities falling into high risk categories. The literature addresses that for the LSI.
- For women the LSI-R does not assess very well for financial and family/relationship domains.
- The Low Risk category on the CARAS means low risk for new court filing for a felony or misdemeanor within three years of release from incarceration.
- Kim noted that on Page 5 technical parole returns and the CDOC inmate population has similar numbers.
- The statement that a tool has inherent bias in it is in many ways a myth because it’s not necessarily the case and is dependent on different populations.
- The literature recommends that if a region (e.g. a state) is concerned about distribution, they should develop their own tool, with their own data, on their own population.

- An interim study committee has been created by the General Assembly to study profiling by peace officers during the interim between the 2015 and 2016 legislative sessions.
- The “Profiling – Initiated Contacts by Law Enforcement (PICLE) Interim Study Committee” had a meeting last week with presentations about the idea of collecting race/ethnicity data and whether that accurately predicts racial profiling, etc.
- They’re traveling down a path of trying to determine if there’s a common way to collect race and ethnicity data.
- Jana Locke could report out at the next Re-entry meeting with an overview of her experience with PICLE, which seems to dovetail with what this working group is talking about

### **Conditions Working Group**

#### *PRESENTATION DISCUSSION*

- At the last meeting a group was formed to look at people in Probation, Parole and Community Corrections who are subject to ‘Conditions’.
- Mark Evans and Jen Bradford are the leads for this group which also includes Alfredo Pena, Sherri Hufford, Glenn Tapia and Melissa Roberts.
- Study areas include ‘what’ conditions are used, the process for imposing conditions and what those conditions mean in terms of someone’s supervision
- Working group members came together for their inaugural meeting today before the start of this meeting.
- The Focus of the first meeting was on the question of the **purpose** of conditions.
- The general consensus of the group was that the purpose of conditions is to maintain a level of control necessary to work with an offender, to encourage prosocial behavior and to address criminogenic needs.
- There was support among the group to take a look at what we’re doing in terms of imposing conditions.
- The next step is to pull together all the conditions currently being imposed, looking at evidence-based practice and see how the two come together.
- The group is excited to serve the Re-entry Task Force and will provide further updates.
- Melissa added that there’s also a general consensus that we’re not doing things the right way. The shift toward evidence-based practices has not trickled down to terms and conditions.
- T’s and C’s are currently more geared toward surveillance than addressing criminogenic needs.
- The overall question is why do we use the conditions we use, and how do they impact the outcomes.
- This work started with the question of ‘how do we address the high number of tech violations?’ which are a result of conditions proposed in the first place.
- Also, part of the difficulty is in talking about the purpose. Why is it that we use conditions?

- Another issue that surfaced is that conditions are discussed for parole and probation, but in comm. corr. there's no such thing as conditions. So at that point do we get into the 'house rule' of community corrections issues?
- There are definitely some general categories that all/most community correction facilities use.
- There is consensus among group members that there is probably a deeper philosophical conversation that needs to occur, but much of that will likely be somewhat hindered by statutory requirements.
- The group wants to try to see if they can come up with some sort of better approach to tailoring conditions rather than being so robotic about them.
- Philosophically trying to find a way to move away from mechanical process of assigning conditions.

### **Definitions Working Group**

#### *PRESENTATION DISCUSSION*

- This small working group is made up of Stan Hilkey, Rick Raemisch and Eric Philp.
- The purpose of this group was to look at definitions of recidivism and technical violations across Probation, Parole and Community Corrections and discuss the feasibility/necessity for common definitions.
- Stan and Rick held a conference call to discuss the issue but Eric was out of town and unable to participate. In his absence, Eric had his staff send a number of concerns in regard to issue of definitions.
- Stan reported that the conversation began by looking at a common definition for recidivism, but that then morphed into a discussion of what does a statewide definition look like.
- Stan and Rick thought the Re-entry Task Force should ask itself what are we the group is trying to accomplish with a common definition.
- There's different nuance between what each agency tracks and why.
- Stan reported that the conversation isn't finished on this issue but without knowing the 'purpose' for commonality it's difficult to determine how much time and effort is worth everyone agreeing on one definition. And it's unknown whether it's even possible to get to one definition.
- With recidivism definitions there are issues over new commitments vs. new filings.
- There are also questions about whether recidivism should be measured at 24 months vs. 36 months.
- Should recidivism include things that may not be a new conviction but that send someone back to prison or jail?
- With recidivism issues we also need to clarify how data is pulled. Is it one year post termination, does juvenile information count, do ordinance violations count, are we pulling the info because someone has successfully completed? There's real nuance in how data is pulled.
- Is there more crime being committed and what is it costing, is that what we want to know?
- It's problematic to try to get away from each entity using their own

	<p>system of pulling and reporting data – it means something to them specifically with how they plan and how they do things. This gets back to what is the need for a common definition between different agencies with different populations and different purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If we want to have a universal number as far as what goes on – what are we trying to find out?</li> <li>• Kim explained to the task force that about 15 years ago the General Assembly wanted a common definition for recidivism. DYC, Probation, and DCJ agreed to all use the same definition of recidivism, which is new felony/misdemeanor filing one year following successful program completion.</li> <li>• However, things have changed at DYC and they are now using a definition of 3 years out.</li> <li>• Robert shared that Human Services is also looking at family stability not just child stability.</li> <li>• The longer your period of observation the worse your outcomes in that more people fail over time.</li> <li>• Sometimes the solution (like working toward a common definition) starts becoming a bigger problem than the problem we’re trying to fix.</li> <li>• Are we identifying a problem and is the solution more problematic than the problem?</li> <li>• It may be a wiser and more efficient use of our time to possibly publish all the definitions we know in one place, so if an agency is beginning with something new, they could use the definition that aligns most with whatever they’re end goal is.</li> <li>• The ORS has a recidivism page on its web site that presents this information for probation, DYC, DOC, and YOS, at <a href="https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/dcj-ors/recidivism">https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/dcj-ors/recidivism</a> , and recidivism rates for community corrections can be also be found on the ORS web site at <a href="https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/dcj-ors/community-corrections-profile">https://www.colorado.gov/pacific/dcj-ors/community-corrections-profile</a>.</li> </ul>
--	--

<p><b>Issue/Topic:</b></p> <p>Assessment Discussion</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p>	<p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Paul reminded the group that part of the conversation during last month’s meeting was around the LSI and the newer versions of the tool including the LSI-R and the LS/CMI. There has also been discussion about the version that Colorado uses and why. Kim added that this is a conversation that has gone on for a long period of time. As was requested at the last meeting Kim pulled together some information on the LSI including bias, outcomes and upgrade costs.</p> <p><i>PRESENTATION POINTS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kim explained that she has been looking at the LSI, LSI-R and LS/CMI and has a prepared a handout for the group.</li> <li>• Kim reminded the task force that one of the questions that came up at the last meeting was that of potential cost issues if Colorado were to</li> </ul>
---	---

	<p>upgrade from the LSI-R to the LS/CMI.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This group was interested in what it would take to advance Colorado to use the most updated version of the LSI.</li> <li>• The LSI has evolved through the years and transitioned from the LSI (Level of Supervision Inventory) to the LSI-R (Level of Supervision Inventory Revised) to the current LS/CMI (Level of Service/Case Management Inventory). Note that the LSI and the LSI-R are the same instruments; they have different names for copyright reasons.</li> <li>• Kim noted that everyone has a handout showing which states are using what instrument.</li> <li>• One of the questions from this group about transitioning Colorado from the LSI-R to the LS/CMI was that of how to address training on the new instrument.</li> <li>• Kim spoke to a colleague in another state that transitioned to the LS/CMI and apparently if there's a week of 'training the trainers' on a new instrument Colorado would probably be able to pursue implementation. This ongoing training would just replace current regular training on the LSI-R.</li> <li>• The creators of the instrument say that in the LS/CMI they have fixed the issues around gender differences that are present in the LSI and the LSI-R.</li> <li>• The LS/CMI also includes a case management component.</li> <li>• With the LSI and the LSI-R, people are well trained at completing the instrument but don't necessarily transfer that information into a case plan. The LS/CMI requires the development of a case plan in the process of completing the instrument.</li> <li>• As for LS/CMI cost, West Virginia reports that they're using the LS/CMI at a cost of \$30,000/year, which covers 10,000 offenders. West Virginia shared that they're not being charged for any offenders above that 10K amount.</li> <li>• There are five sections to the LS/CMI instrument including risk and case management. The tool also captures responsivity. There are ways to quantify overrides, a progress record and the very final part of the instrument has a termination piece explaining how the person will receive services at discharge.</li> <li>• This is a progressive component of the assessment process.</li> <li>• Apparently the creators of the tool (MHS) also have an online web-based system which allows for sharing of information across agencies.</li> <li>• Sherri explained that Probation contracts the original creators of the LSI (Bonta and Andrews) directly and that Probation has maintained an existing agreement with them directly.</li> <li>• The current cost of contract is \$42,000.</li> <li>• Items captured in the LS/CMI that aren't in the LSI-R include additional risk factors, information about the prison experience, non-criminogenic needs (such as housing), and 10 responsivity factors that force the case manager to consider cultural issues, learning disabilities, behavioral health problems, etc.</li> <li>• Regi added that the WRNA is a very good risk assessment specific to women.</li> </ul>
--	---

- She added that the City and County of Denver’s Crime Prevention and Control Commission uses the WRNA in the jail.
- There’s a way to use a trailer with the LSI-R or the COMPAS tool to adapt them more to women’s issues.
- But even with a trailer identifying women’s issues – we’re still using a male based tool to look at women.
- Regi stated that there’s still a problem if African Americans are rating as high risk across the board on assessment tools and there’s another issue going on with the age cohort.
- If populations under 26, women, and African Americans are all rating high risk is there something else taking place.
- Regi reiterated her three concerns:
  - 1 validity for populations under 26
  - 2 validity of the LSI-R when it comes to women and race
  - 3 and inter-rater reliability
- Kim shared that when it comes to the CARAS there aren’t inter-rater reliability issues because the CARAS is not filled out by an individual, but rather is self-populated using data in the DOC’s management information system. However, if the data in the MIS is not accurate, neither will be the information on the CARAS.
- For the LSI we can’t answer inter-rater reliability without doing a study; the LSI hasn’t been studied in Colorado since the 1990s.
- Robert shared that the Office of Children, Youth and Family Services has developed their own instrument that has been validated. It’s called the Colorado Juvenile Risk Assessment (CJRA).
- Judicial uses the CJRA also.
- It sounds like there have been quite a few work-arounds to address issues in the LSI/R.
- Is it worth a call to MHS in terms of cost issues?
- In terms of race and ethnicity – in order to go further than where we are right now, we would have to do more research in terms of what is relevant.
- Any risk assessment tool may place minorities in higher-risk categories based on other biased that may be inherent in the broader system. For example, “arrested before age 16” is an item in the LSI, and could be dependent on living in a high crime area with a greater police presence.
- Heather stated that there are questions on the LSI-R that get to the point of family and relationships.
- There can also be responsivity issues when you’re talking about younger populations. We can also look at issues through a resiliency lens.
- Sherri offered that it’s not a perfect tool, but it’s doing the best with what we have, it’s good, it’s not bad. There are some pros with the LS/CMI tool. The big question for this group is, is it worth the switch? Also, what are the implementation challenges of adding the CMI part?
- List of questions for MHS-
  - Ongoing question about developing future trainers
  - How have other states managed the switch to the LS/CMI
  - What about train the trainer sustainability?
  - What about cost



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If there's an infrastructure in place for LSI-R, the switch would be a onetime switch to get them upgraded to be certified for LS/CMI.</li> <li>• It's one thing to take current trainers and do a one-time upgrade, but switching to a totally different tool is completely different.</li> <li>• Can training for trainers be done internally at Probation, or does that need to be contracted out?</li> </ul>
--	---

<p><b>Issue/Topic:</b></p> <p>Next steps and Adjourn</p> <p><b>Action:</b></p>	<p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <p>Paul Herman reviewed outcomes from today's meeting and next steps moving forward.</p> <p><i>DISCUSSION POINTS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Conditions Working Group has identified their next steps and plans going forward. They will meet between now and the next meeting.</li> <li>• Staff will work with Stan and the Definitions Working Group to publish all the definitions in one place.</li> <li>• As for the Race/Ethnicity/Gender Working Group, if possible staff will schedule a presentation from Jana Lock on the work of the PICLE committee at the next Re-entry meeting.</li> <li>• Another issue for next month's agenda is the use of alternatives to incarceration for technical violators.</li> <li>• When the technical violations work is completed, the group will then move onto the issue of collateral consequences.</li> </ul>
--	---

**Next Meeting**

October 7<sup>th</sup>, (Wednesday)    1:30pm – 4:30pm    700 Kipling St., 4<sup>th</sup> floor training room

### Risk Assessment Instruments and Race/Ethnicity

LSI—predicts risk and identifies need areas

- Among those convicted in FY14 who had an LSI completed within 100 days before/after conviction date (70% of all convictions),
  - Compared to White and “Other,” Blacks were more likely to score high on the LSI (38% of Blacks scored high compared to 30% of Whites and 26% of Other).

CARAS –predicts risk/recidivism (Colorado Actuarial Risk Assessment Scale, used by the parole board)

- Among 2008-2012 parole releases and parole eligible inmates,
  - Blacks and Native Americans were less likely to score very low/low risk, and more likely to score high/very high.
  - Women were slightly more likely to score low/very low and very high risk.
- Overall AUC (Area Under Curve)=.75\*
  - AUC for
    - Females .73
    - Males .75
    - Blacks .72
    - Asians .74
    - Whites .74
    - Hispanic .78
    - Native Am .75

\*AUC is a statistical property that represents the rate of “hits” (recidivism) relative to false alarms (errors).

Technical parole returns by race/ethnicity

- The profile of race/ethnicity of people revoked in FY14 was very similar to the profile of people by race/ethnicity in the prison population.
- Whites in the Very Low Risk category were more likely to be revoked and Hispanics were less likely to be revoked.
- Revocation rates for Blacks were relatively stable across risk categories (approximately 20%) with the exception of the very high risk category where 23.5% of Blacks were revoked.
- Women were slightly more likely to be revoked than men.

**Risk Assessment and Race/Ethnicity**

Convictions for cases filed in District Court in FY14 having an LSI within 100 days before/after conviction date:  
LSI score by race

	LSI Total Score							
	High		Medium		Low		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Black	38%	878	36%	833	26%	597	100%	2,308
Other	26%	496	37%	701	37%	704	100%	1,901
White	30%	4,831	36%	5,859	35%	5,683	100%	16,373

Data Source: Data extracted from the Colorado Judicial Branch's information management system (ICON) via the Colorado Justice Analytics Support System (CJASS) and analyzed by the Division of Criminal Justice. Note these figures represent cases, not individuals. Excludes Denver County court cases.

Note that an LSI was found for 70% of convictions in FY 14.

**CARAS 6 RISK LEVEL BY GENDER AND ETHNICITY:  
Percentages within Race/ethnicity and Gender**

	Total N	CARAS Risk Score					Total
		Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High	
Asian	451	19%	16%	24%	29%	13%	100%
Hispanic	18,586	14%	12%	20%	29%	25%	100%
Caucasian	26,355	11%	10%	21%	32%	25%	100%
African American	10,822	7%	9%	20%	34%	30%	100%
Native American	1,793	6%	8%	19%	32%	35%	100%
Female	7,123	9%	9%	21%	32%	28%	100%
Male	50,885	11%	11%	21%	31%	26%	100%
<b>Total</b>	<b>58,007</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: 2008-2012 parole releases and parole-eligible inmates. Prepared by DCJ/ORS.

**Percentages within Risk Level**

	Total N	CARAS Risk Score					Total
		Very Low	Low	Medium	High	Very High	
Asian	451	1.3%	1.2%	0.9%	0.7%	0.4%	0.8%
Hispanic	18586	40.5%	35.4%	31.2%	29.9%	30.3%	32.0%
Caucasian	26355	44.4%	45.1%	47.2%	46.1%	43.9%	45.4%
African American	10822	12.3%	15.9%	17.9%	20.1%	21.3%	18.7%
Native American	1793	1.5%	2.4%	2.8%	3.2%	4.2%	3.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>58007</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>
Female	7,123	10.5%	11.0%	12.5%	12.5%	13.1%	12.3%
Male	50,885	89.5%	89.0%	87.5%	87.5%	86.9%	87.7%
<b>Total</b>	<b>58007</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: 2008-2012 parole releases and parole-eligible inmates. Prepared by DCJ/ORS.

**CARAS items**

- 1<sup>st</sup> = Number of conviction charges associated with the current incarceration
- 2<sup>nd</sup> = Number of prior Colorado parole revocations
- 3<sup>rd</sup> = Most recent Level of Supervision Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) total score
- 4<sup>th</sup> = Custody level classification instrument score – this incarceration
- 5<sup>th</sup> = Number of prior Colorado escapes or absconds
- 6<sup>th</sup> = Most recent Substance Abuse Simple Screening Instrument (SSI) total score
- 7<sup>th</sup> = Arrested under age 16 (yes/no)
- 8<sup>th</sup> = Age at projected release
- 9<sup>th</sup> = Number of unique Colorado prison incarcerations not involving a parole return

**Technical Parole Returns\* by CARAS Risk Level and Race/Ethnicity \*  
Fiscal Years 2012-2014**

	CARAS Risk Level**										Total	
	Very Low		Low		Medium		High		Very High		%	N
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N		
Caucasian	55.16%	567	49.57%	922	44.95%	752	43.90%	964	39.05%	1,325	44.63%	4,530
Hispanic	20.43%	210	25.27%	470	29.53%	494	29.96%	658	32.66%	1,108	28.97%	2,940
African American	20.33%	209	19.84%	369	20.32%	340	21.08%	463	23.52%	798	21.47%	2,179
Native American	3.40%	35	4.57%	85	4.18%	70	4.46%	98	4.51%	153	4.34%	441
Asian	0.68%	7	0.75%	14	1.02%	17	0.59%	13	0.27%	9	0.59%	60

\*Data includes offenders returning to CDOC as *technical parole violators* during FY 12-14. This does not include offenders with new felonies convictions, but can include offenders with new misdemeanor offenses.

\*\*CARAS score included is the score taken most recently at the time of release to parole.

**CDOC Inmate Profile as of  
7/31/2015**

Caucasian	46.34%
Hispanic	31.50%
African American	18.28%
Native American	2.91%
Asian	0.97%

Technical Returns by CARAS Risk Level and Gender

	Very Low		Low		Medium		High		Very High	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
FY 2012										
F	11.49%	34	10.00%	55	11.60%	53	14.38%	89	11.68%	110
M	88.51%	262	89.40%	464	88.40%	404	85.02%	530	88.32%	832
FY 2013										
F	9.01%	31	11.25%	71	11.87%	64	12.25%	85	9.79%	114
M	90.99%	313	88.75%	560	88.13%	475	87.75%	609	90.21%	1,050
FY 2014										
F	9.28%	36	12.54%	89	13.74%	93	12.34%	109	9.79%	126
M	90.72%	352	87.46%	621	86.26%	584	87.66%	774	90.21%	1,161

\*Data includes offenders returning to CDOC as technical parole violators during FY12-14. This does not include offenders with new felonies convictions, but can include offenders with new misdemeanor offenses.  
 \*\*CARAS score included is the score taken most recently at the time of release to parole.

CDOC Inmate Profile as of 7/31/2015

Female	9.89%	<i>TV returns</i>
Male	90.11%	<i>11.5%</i>
		<i>88.5%</i>